

REMARKS

Claims 13-21, 24-33 are pending. Claims 16, 17, 27, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 USC 112. Claims 13-18, 24-26, and 30 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication 2004/0204076A1 (Kotzin) in view of US 7,177,287 B1 (Herring et al). Claim 29 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotzin in view of Herring and US 7,343,156 B2 (Alberti). Claim 31 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotzin in view of Herring and US 6,968,178 B2 (Pradhan). Claim 33 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotzin in view of Herring and US 6,741,864 B2 (Wilcock). Claims 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotzin in view of Pradhan. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotzin in view of Pradhan, Herring, and Alberti. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotzin in view of Pradhan and Wilcock. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotzin in view of Alberti. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotzin in view of Alberti and Wilcock.

Claims 27, 32, and 33 are canceled herein. Claims 13, 16, 17, 19, 28, are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 13-21, 24-26, and 28-31 are presented for examination. Applicant's paragraph numbers mentioned herein are relative to the substitute specification.

Clarifications of Office Action

In the office action page 3, second line from bottom, Examiner states that Applicant's claims 27, 32, and 33 require a further telecommunications terminal, e.g. element 103. However, there is no element 103 in the present Application. Element 103 is a device in Kotzin. In any case, claims 27, 32, and 33 are canceled herein.

In the office action page 5, line 8, Examiner refers to Kotzin FIG 2, user interface 112. There is no element 112 in Kotzin. Applicant assumes Examiner means element 211 of Kotzin.

Response to rejections under 35 USC 112

The word "only" is removed from claims 16 and 17.

Claims 27, 32, and 33 are canceled.

Response to rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

Amendments to the independent claims 13, 19, and 28 herein clarify that Applicant's telecommunications terminal establishes a plurality of connections, and displays availability information about a plurality of external gateways or other terminals for user selection. Such plural connections as claimed are not taught by Kotzin, Herring, or Pradhan. Herring teaches means for voice and data transmission over a single link between a base station and a unitary mobile transceiving unit. While this feature may be useful in its own right, it does not address the deficiencies of Kotzin argued below with respect to the independent claims. Pradhan transmits a selection of advertisements over a wireless link to another terminal. Again, this does not address the deficiencies of Kotzin with respect to the independent claims as argued below.

The independent claims 13, 19, and 28 are amended to recite "*wherein absence of displayed information about a particular one of the external gateways indicates that said particular one of the external gateways is not within range of the telecommunications terminal.*" This agrees with Examiner's holding in page 3, lines 5-8 of the office action, and is supported by the following parts of the specification in combination.

Applicant's par. 21, lines 1-2: "*The agent visualizes the identifications of the locally available gateways and the possible forms of communication associated with them and supported by it.*"

Applicant's par. 25, all lines: "*In terms of dynamic gateway access, the local-area radio receiver of the, or of each, external gateway in the system has a threshold discriminator for recording the entry into the radio transmission range of the, or of a, telecommunications terminal. Connected to the output of the threshold discriminator is a communications-start controller for initiating a communications-start procedure with the telecommunications terminal concerned such that upon entry into radio*

transmission range, optionally subject to a positive authentication check, message traffic is established between the telecommunications terminal and the gateway."

Applicant's par. 34, all lines: *"A typical sequence in the use of this system by the user assumed here (father of the family) is approximately as follows: he is at home in the attic and sees on the display of his agent 3 a that he can accept calls and conduct outgoing calls via the analog fixed-network PSTN and via the gateway 23 a of his company car 21 a which is standing in front of the house. He sees that both his wife's car and her agent are not displayed, that she has therefore left the house in her car. He presses the symbol for his older son's agent, who then answers and informs him that his assumption is correct and asks him down for breakfast."*

Applicant's par. 36, lines 1-3: *"We could cite as a further concrete example family members meeting up in town who could recognize their proximity to one another by the appearance on their own display of the respective other agent."*

The above teachings in combination provide means, motivation, and two examples that support the above new recitation in the independent claims 13, 19, and 28. No new matter is added.

Claim 17 is further amended to recite *"important ones of the external gateways"*. This is supported in Applicant's par. 16, line 3-5: *". . . the gateways should only communicate with agents which have been cleared for them. As a spin-off, the agents should thus also display only the gateways which are really important for the user."*

Examiner asserts that Kotzin's memory 227 teaches Applicant's claimed feature of *"a user-data memory that stores connection-data records of the plurality of predetermined connections which can be established with the external gateways and an internal gateway"* as found in Applicant's par. 14.

However, Kotzin's memory contains routines 233, 235, 237, 239 for resource discovery and establishing connections (Kotzin par. 16). This is not the same as an address book of connection-data records of a plurality of predetermined connections of authorized gateways. A plurality of routines is not the same as a plurality of connection records. Applicant's telecommunication terminal establishes and displays connections to a plurality of external gateways simultaneously as they come within range so that a user can see which gateways are currently available and can select

from a display of the available gateways. Applicant's connection-data records for a plurality of connections provide means to establish and maintain such a plurality of selectable connections.

On page 7, lines 6-9, Examiner asserts that Kotzin teaches "*wherein only information about external gateways within range of the local-area transceiver defined by at least one of the stored data records is displayed for selection.*" Examiner bases this assertion on Kotzin, FIG 4, step 417 (displaying availability of detected external device from step 403, par. 28-29). However, these parts of Kotzin merely describe detecting a single external device, not a plurality of them as claimed. Thus the term "only" here is moot, since only one such device is ever considered. Furthermore, Examiner's own logic argues against finding "only" in Kotzin. See the office action page 3, lines 5-13: "*The Examiner submits . . . scope disclosed*". Also, regarding this assertion, Kotzin does not teach "stored connection-data records" as argued above.

Since neither Kotzin nor Herring nor Pradhan teach the above features as recited in the independent claims, the cited combinations do not support the 35 USC 103 rejections of any of the independent claims.

Conclusion

M.P.E.P. 2143.03 provides that to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.

As argued above, the proposed combinations of Kotzin, Herring, and Pradhan lack features of the independent claims herein. Alberti and Wilcock do not address these deficiencies. Thus the proposed combinations do support the obviousness rejections of the claimed invention. Applicants feel this application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept. 27, 2008

By: Janet D. Hood
Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830